DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 655 FL 026 832

AUTHOR Hall, Helena
TITLE When Background Matters: Three Writing Center Employees' Views on ESL Students.
PUB DATE 2001-03-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (52nd, Denver, CO, March 14-17, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; English for Academic Purposes; *English (Second Language); Foreign Students; Higher Education; Interviews; Process Approach (Writing); Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction; *Writing Laboratories; Writing Skills; Writing Teachers
IDENTIFIERS University of Illinois Urbana Champaign

ABSTRACT

This paper presents findings based on interviews with three employees of a university writing center about their experience tutoring foreign students. International students who are not native speakers of English but want to enroll in American universities must demonstrate a basic level of competence in English before they can participate in a degree program. This is especially difficult for some students, as writing is sometimes not valued in some countries as much as it is in the United States. Teaching students to write at a level required in U.S. higher education is often doubly difficult because they struggle not only with English, but they also try to learn the conventions of writing at the same time. Even when the student has researched the topic, they have great difficulty putting a paper together properly. One source of the problem for foreign students is that it is common for the staff at a university's writing center to be students from that institution's English department. They may indeed be skilled writers but often have few skills in teaching a non-native speaker of English to write well in English. Policies that "treat all students the same," while well-intentioned, result in the needs of foreign students often being overlooked. Little research has been done in this area, and more needs to be done. In the meantime, writing center employees need to become more aware of the special needs of non-native speakers of English. (Contains 26 references.) (KFT)

ED 455 695

When Background Matters: Three Writing Center Employees' Views on ESL Students

Helena Hall

Presented at
Conference on College Composition and Communication
in Denver 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Helena Hall

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

International students who are not native speakers of English and who want to enroll in undergraduate or graduate courses at a US college or university have to prove that they are proficient in English (Educational Testing Service, 1996). Most schools (for example, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000; University of California at Los Angeles, 2000; and Cornell University, 2000) require a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) score of at least 550 in order to consider these students for admission. In addition to the TOEFL, individual departments at colleges and universities (for example, Division of English as an International Language at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000) can also require the international students to take the TOEFL essay test (a separate test) where they are asked to write a short essay that is holistically scored by trained raters (Educational Testing Service, 1996). Even though they receive both the TOEFL and essay scores they need in order to attend a US college or university, this does not necessarily mean that they are going to be successful writers in a college setting (Educational Testing Service, 1996).

Almost every college or university class ESL students enroll in will require them to write at least one paper. In order to get a good grade, they not only have to know the information about the topic to put in the paper, but they also have to know the rhetorical conventions, such as organization, introduction, and conclusion, for writing in this setting (Leki, 1995b). This puts ESL students under enormous pressure, because writing is culture bound and the writing instruction they have had before enrolling in US colleges or universities might not be valued (Pennycook, 1996, Matalene, 1985). This is especially true for ESL students who come from foreign countries. In this study, however, ESL students are all students who are not native speakers of English.

When ESL students do not know the rhetorical conventions for writing, they are not going to write papers that receive high grades (Bartholomae, 1986). Even though they have

researched a topic carefully and know the facts, they might have problems putting the paper together in an appropriate way. American college and university teachers expect their students to follow a given format (Connor & Kramer, 1995; Leki, 1995a). If students do not follow this format, the result might be a low grade.

Another problem area for ESL students is syntax and vocabulary. When writing a paper, it is critical to use correct grammar and use words that fit the context (Engber, 1995). According to Holt (1997), teachers often downgrade papers that have many grammatical mistakes and favor papers that are correct in terms of grammar. Often it does not matter how good their ideas are, many teachers are not able to see beyond the surface problems (Holt, 1997). As a result, ESL students must learn both English grammar and new vocabulary.

On many US college and university campuses, there is a writing center where students can go and get help with their papers. The people working there are trained to help students with any type of writing assignment they might have. Many ESL students take advantage of this place because they are able to get one-on-one tutoring, they are able to ask any question they might have about writing, they can try new ideas when writing, and the writing tutor goes over the paper in order to help the students improve; the writing tutor does not evaluate students' papers, and they get immediate feedback (Cark, 1985, p. 79).

Review of literature

Performance problems

ESL students who enroll at US colleges or universities need to learn how to write in an academic setting. In order to do well in classes that require them to write papers, they have to understand what the teachers expect of them. If ESL students have problems, these are often perceived to be language related (Schneider & Fujishima, 1995). Motivation and discipline are

often said to be the main reasons as to why ESL students succeed or fail; however, these two aspects alone might not determine how well they will do--the ESL student described in Schneider & Fujishima's (1995) study was very motivated to study and learn, but he still did not do well.

Many ESL students experience problems when they are writing a paper; some of them are not even sure how to start. When this happens, it is good to have somebody to bounce ideas off. The writing center most often deals with written papers, but students are also able to come in and brainstorm their topic and get help starting to write. Dyson (1995) states that "talk is not encoded in their [young children's] writing; rather, talk surrounds their writing . . . over time . . . speech becomes both writing's raw material and its guiding tool" (p. 44). The students in Dyson's (1995) study are elementary school students, but they can be compared to adult ESL students because they sometimes need to talk out their paper before starting to write; they want to make sure that they have a good topic and that they are able to develop it into a paper.

Cultural problems

Many ESL students who attend US colleges or universities have received parts of their education outside the country; this can create a problem because there might be cultural differences between the classroom in their home country and the US classroom (Johnson, 1997). One problem is that students from foreign countries use different learning strategies; Asian students, for example, are taught to memorize texts and be able to recite them (Matalene, 1985; Pennycook, 1996; Johnson, 1997). When asked to attribute their sources--giving credit to authors whose work they summarize, paraphrase, and/or quote–many have difficulties doing so, because they are not used to doing it. LoCastro & Masuko's (1997) study shows how one Japanese student plagiarized sources in her senior thesis. The only time she referred to the author was when she quoted him/her directly (p. 12). Even though she included both summaries and paraphrases of authors, she never gave the reader the reference. When confronting students in

their study, LoCastro & Masuko (1997) found out possible reasons as to why students had plagiarized sources. One reason is that they do not learn what plagiarism is when they are taught to write academic papers in Japanese (p. 16); the writing teachers seem to overlook this aspect of writing and let the students copy sources without any attribution. Scollon (1994) shows that it is often difficult for ESL students to give proper attribution.

Being an ESL student can create a clash between the learning experience in school and the home literacy. Because schools mainly focus on the mainstream students, the native English speakers, what ESL students learn at home is often not valued in the classroom. The two students Noll (1998) describes are native English speakers and grew up in the US; however, they still experience problems in school. Outside of school, the students take active part in cultural events. In the classroom, however, they seem more passive and do not perform well. Their native culture is important to them, but the teachers do not really give them a chance to work on anything about it when in school. Their situation is similar to many ESL students–they live in two cultures and are not able to connect the two. When they come to the writing center, the tutors might not know anything about their culture; instead, they will approach them from "an American" perspective (Powers, 1993).

Tutor beliefs

Tutors in a writing center often come from many different educational backgrounds; some of them are more experienced writing teachers than others. In a session where a tutor and a student discusses a paper, the tutor's approach to teaching will appear; the way he/she interacts with the student is attributed to different influences on his/her teaching approach. Sturlevant (1996) describes how two history teachers beliefs' about teaching has influenced them. She divides their experiences into two groups--early and late. The early period refers to the time the subjects were students and also to their student teaching period; the late period discusses how

they are going to workshops and talking to their spouses about teaching (pp. 241-242, p. 246-247). Sturlevant (1996) clearly shows that teaching evolves over time and that teachers are influenced by different people throughout their career. Since teachers are expected to attend workshops where they talk about their teaching, it is natural that they listen to what other teachers share. If they like something they hear, they might include that in their own teaching.

The writing center is, in one way, like a classroom–there is a student and a teacher. The difference is that there is more interaction between them and that the teacher is able to pay attention to one student and his/her needs. Moje (1996) states that "each classroom culture is defined by the teachers' and students' . . . philosophies and knowledge about the discipline, teaching and learning in that discipline, and teaching and learning in general . . . past school experiences and their roles in schools and schooling" (p. 175). When interacting with a student, the tutor may have a different view of how to teach writing than him/her; this is especially true when the tutor is a native English speaker and the student is not. At this time, two different educational systems might clash. The tutor will act in a way that is appropriate in an American writing classroom whereas the ESL student might not. What one of them thinks is appropriate to do is not necessarily supported by the other. "The discourses, or ideologies, that shape literacy also shape teaching and learning; that is, teaching and learning are also socially constructed acts" (Moje, 1996, p. 176).

Most tutors in US writing centers use process writing–focus on the development of the paper. They ask the students questions about the paper in order for them to develop it more. According to Reyes (1992), "process instruction is not working as effectively as might be expected and is not being tailored to the needs of linguistically different students" (p. 431). Process writing instruction was developed for mainstream, native English speaking students. What works for this group of students will not necessarily work for another group. When entering the school system, there are students who do not speak English or very little English.

Since most of what goes on in the classroom is tailored to the main-stream students, those who do not speak the language are supposed to learn it as fast as possible so that they can achieve academically. Reyes (1992) points out that one reason behind the assumption that process instruction does not work well for all students is the "'one size fits all' approach" (p. 435). It is impossible to put all students in the same group. Native English speaking students and ESL students have different needs. Applying a process that is tailored to one group on another group is not a good idea.

Problems

Traditionally, writing center tutors come from the English department. They are good writers and have experience teaching the subject. However, most people who come from this department do not have any training in how to approach ESL students. In the classes they teach, there are predominately native English speaking students. When working in the writing center, they are going to encounter students from a variety of language backgrounds. Powers (1993) points out that one problem is that the staff in the writing center do not have enough training (p. 39). They have not been taught how to approach ESL students and how best to help them. They therefore work with them the same way as with native speakers, and this does often not work. Powers (1993) also states that the staff uses collaborative techniques but that these are not very effective with ESL students (p. 40). Not understanding that what works for a native speaker does not always work for an ESL student is important to understand–there is no single way to approach students, because all of them will not fit the mold (Reyes, 1992).

Setting

This study takes place at a large university in the Midwest. According to the International Student Office (2000), more than 3,000 ESL students attend the university. Students who are

interested in getting help with their writing assignments can go to the writing center which is a free service to students, faculty, and staff at the university. They can bring in any type of writing assignment at any stage of the writing process–some students need help brainstorming their topic, some need help writing a first draft, some need help revising, some need help organizing ideas, etc. Bringing in writing assignments that are not a part of course requirements is also fairly common; when applying for a job, many students want someone to look over their resume and cover letter. However, according to policy, those who bring in their writing will not be graded or evaluated, nor can they ask someone to proofread. The writing center focuses on process writing, where the development of ideas, organization, a clear and supported thesis, etc. are very important. It is crucial to point out that this is not a remedial service. Not only "bad" writers go to the writing center to get help. Each semester, the writing center has about 2,000 appointments –about half of them consists of undergraduate students.

When students come to the writing center, they are asked to bring the assignment sheet the teacher gave them in class (if he/she gave them one). The person helping the student needs to make sure that he/she follows the assignment. After reading this, it is up to the student what he/she wants to work on. Normally the student reads out his/her paper loud, so he/she can hear what it sounds like. Powers (1993) states that this is a good strategy (p. 42), because students can hear mistakes they make; however, this is more true for native English speaking students than for ESL students. In the writing center, students are able to talk about their papers, ask questions, and ask for help improving their papers.

The writing center is under the English department. There are seventeen people working there. This job is, for most of them, a 33% teaching assistantship; however, due to school work and other work responsibilities, some people have a 17% assistantship. Everyone works eight hours a week. Those who have a 33% assistantship has an additional responsibility–some teach mini-classes on different topics, for example, using sources in the research paper, how to work

with long term writing projects (MA theses or dissertations); some work on maintaining the writing center's web page.

In order to work in the writing center, the employees have to be experienced writers. Most employees have taught at least one writing class. The majority of the employees are Ph.D. students in various stages of their education. They come from several different disciplines on campus, for example, English literature, composition studies, education, speech communication, and political science.

Before a semester starts, new employees are required to attend a two day orientation session where they learn how to tutor students from different disciplines and look at writing samples.

Participants

Most people working in the writing center have no background in teaching ESL and in ESL methods. I wanted to find out how employees perceive the ESL students they work with. When choosing participants for the study, I focused on four concepts: (1) the subjects' educational background, (2) previous work experience, (3) gender, and (4) native language. Even though several people in the writing center could have participated in my study, I decided to ask people who I have worked with in the past–people I knew and who I get along with. All of those I had in mind when setting up the study agreed to participate.

John, a second year Ph.D. student in Liberal Arts and Sciences, did not have any ESL training when he started working at the writing center in the fall of 1998. However, during the time he has worked there, he has learned a lot about ESL methods and how to teach writing to ESL students. During the past year, he has been able to read books and articles about the topic.

Sue, a Ph.D. student in education, has extensive training in ESL; she received an MA in TESL. She has taught ESL overseas for two years. She started working at the writing center in

the fall of 1999.

Amy, a Ph.D. student in Liberal Arts and Sciences (in a different department than John), has no training in ESL, and she did not work with ESL students prior to starting to work at the writing center in the fall of 1999.

When collecting the data for the study, I used a qualitative method. This method worked well, because I wanted "to provide an in-depth description of a specific . . . practice" (Mertens, 1998, p.159). For analyzing the data, I used the Constructivist/Interpretive paradigm because I had specific questions I wanted to research--writing center employees' view of ESL students' writing and whether their educational background and previous work experience played a role when working

with these students. The study is small because I wanted to analyze the data in-depth and look at the outcome.

In order to gather data, I constructed a questionnaire with six questions. The reason behind the questions is that I wanted to see whether the employees' background as teachers and their education played a role when working with ESL students and their writing. Each participant was interviewed once. All of them were asked the same six questions, and the interview took about 30 minutes. As I was interviewing the subjects, additional questions were asked in order to clarify what the subjects talked about.

Interview Questions

The interview questions gave the employees an opportunity to think about their experience working with ESL students. Even though the questionnaire does not explicitly ask them about their academic background, I expected them to mention something about it when they discussed question number 6. The questionnaire also provides them a chance to talk about their tutoring methods. When working with ESL students, it is important that employees are trained to

do so–I also wanted to find out what they thought about the training they were provided when first starting to work at the writing center.

1. What kind of services do you offer ESL students?
2. Describe one or two of your ESL students (students you have worked with more than once).
3. In what ways do ESL students respond differently than native English speakers to instruction?
4. How does the writing center foster ESL students' writing ability?
5. What do you think ESL students most desire from the writing center?
6. What kind of training is available to meet ESL students' needs? What kind of training do employees need to help ESL students?

Results

Based on my interpretation of the data, I make the following conclusion–employees educational background and previous work experience play an important role when working with ESL students in the writing center. All three participants talked about their previous experience with ESL students. The more experience they had before being hired at the writing center, the easier it was for them to help ESL students.

The policy of the writing center is to treat all people who come there the same regardless of nationality and educational status (undergraduate vs. graduate). It is, therefore, not surprising that the participants initially state that ESL students are treated like anyone else. Although saying that all students are treated the same, John claims that ESL students' needs are often different in that they are more textual–they might need help with vocabulary to use in their writing; he also points out that "the process model of writing instruction is not necessarily appropriate all the time for all ESL students." As a result, they are treated slightly different than native English speaking students. Even though Amy also initially claims that she treats all people who come to the writing center the same, she elaborates on her answer and brings up an interesting fact in that

she has noted that there is a difference in the services given to native English speaking and ESL students. In the beginning of a tutoring session, when she asks them what they need help with, they often answer grammar. She states that she is willing to talk to them about it but only in terms of the paper. She does not provide this service to the same extent for native English speakers.

Asking the participants to describe two of their ESL students brought up an interesting issue. They chose to talk about two different types of students–what traditionally have been labeled stronger and weaker writers. Although both John and Amy discuss Kim, a graduate student who is writing his dissertation, they look at his writing and his needs differently. John states that Kim is the kind of person who profits from process writing instruction, because he needs help organizing his paper and come up with ideas. A surprising comment is that after working with Kim for the first time, John did not really want to do it again; he found it frustrating because they were not able to understand each other. Amy's experience with the same student is different. She believes that he is a motivated student who is willing to work but being a motivated student and willing to learn does not help him perform well. Like John, Amy initially thought it was difficult working with Kim because she felt disconnected. However, she does not give any reason as to why.

Sue, the experienced ESL teacher, has noticed that maturity has a lot to do with how well ESL students write. She talks about a student she worked with over a longer period of time and how she was able to develop a relationship with the student. When this student first came in, she was interested in learning how to edit her writing; she knew that this is important to know how to do. Sue had the specific knowledge of how to do this and was willing to share her ideas and talents with the student. Being willing to learn how to edit shows that the student was interested in her writing and willing to take responsibility for it. Amy discusses a similar situation–she worked with an ESL student who had a "high level of commitment to her work" because she was

in graduate school. When asked if she thinks it is a maturity issue, she is not sure. She is not willing to generalize and put students in different categories because they are ESL students or because they are in graduate school. Sue, however, claims that working with graduate ESL students is easier than working with undergraduate ESL students because they are more willing to work with their writing, and they are willing to invest time–the idea is, once again, that maturity plays an important role. In order to show that maturity, according to Sue, do play a role in ESL students' writing, she gives an example of a student who was the opposite of the graduate student. This student was an undergraduate ESL student. When he came to the writing center, he was not willing to take responsibility for his writing; he knew that his writing was not good, but he was more looking for someone who could "fix his paper."

Since the employees work with both native English speaking students and ESL students, it is important to know if these two groups respond differently to instruction. John mentions that ESL students sometimes are passive. By asking questions, employees try to create a dialogue between them and the students they work with–they want them to be actively involved in the discussion about the paper. There are, however, ESL students who do not like this and do not really respond to the questions because they are not interested in long discussions about their writing; instead, they want the employee to focus on what is on the page and nothing else.

The writing center foster ESL students' writing in a variety of ways. John states that he "get[s] more requests for proofreading than anything else." At the same time, he claims that ESL students are grateful for the help they get in the writing center. Even though employees are not supposed to proofread, many of them point out grammatical mistakes as they go through the paper together with the student. John seems to think that helping ESL students with grammar is the best way to foster their writing ability. Sue, on the other hand, says that "I thought that more ESL students would be overly reliant on . . . what they thought should be an editor rather than a teacher." This was the stereotype she had about ESL students before starting to work at the

writing center; however, the stereotype has shown not to be true. According to her, proofreading is not what the students want from the writing center. Since many ESL students want to sound as native as possible, Sue believes that what is most helpful in fostering their writing ability is that she tries to cut out repetitions and replace them with synonyms; she also asks students if they know any synonyms they can use in when writing. According to Amy, the most helpful aspect of the writing center is that it is "flexible" when it comes to working with ESL students–"one formula is not going to work for all people" because students have different needs and abilities. Not all of them are able to start on the same level or get the same end result. The employees also have a lot of flexibility when it comes to working with ESL students. That is helpful to them because the employees can try a variety of approaches and see which one works the best with a particular student.

When working with ESL students, it is important that employees know how to approach them and their writing. All three participants in the study think that they did not have enough training before starting the job. Even though there is a lack of training, there are some employee who have an advantage over other employees. Sue discusses the idea that employees who have learned a second language themselves are better off than those who have not. The employees who know a foreign language understand what the ESL students feel like and how frustrating it can be when writing in a foreign language. Even though there is not enough training in ESL issues and Amy had no training in this field prior to starting to working at the writing center, she "feel[s] it doesn't mean that [she] can't do [her] job well." She is, however, an experienced writing teacher and as such she brings her beliefs about teaching with her to the writing center.

Discussion

The writing center is a place where ESL students can get help with their writing. The employees try to do their best in order to meet their needs. Even though the employees are

experienced writers and know how to teach writing, they are sometimes not able to help ESL students as much as they want. This can, as Powers (1993) points out, depend on the fact that most US writing centers focus on process writing and ESL students might have problems understanding this approach. The employees are, however, aware that there is not a single approach to teaching writing that is going to fit all students (Reyes, 1992).

Asking the participants to talk about two of their ESL students showed me that more research needs to be done in terms of maturity and writing. Traditionally, students have been divided into two groups--strong and weak writers. However, my study shows that there might be two better terms to use–more and less mature writers. Even though it seems like graduate ESL students are more willing to take responsibility for their writing than undergraduate ESL students, it is dangerous to generalize and put students into different categories.

Being able to explain grammar seems important in terms of being an effective ESL teacher. As John stated: to "teach ESL successfully," it is important to know grammar. Whether this is the case is debatable, but the participants feel more comfortable dealing with ESL students when they know English grammar and are able to explain the language's structure.

As a teacher, I see a need to prepare writing center employees to work with ESL students. Before starting to work in the writing center, employees should have a training session where ESL students talked about their needs in terms of writing and the employees were able to practice their tutoring skills. Employees must understand that ESL students might have different needs than the native English speaking students and the way they are used to working with students might have to be slightly altered.

Works Cited

Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the university. Journal of basic writing. (Vol. 5, number 1, pp. 4-19).

Clark, I. (1985). ESL students and the writing center. Writing in the center: Teaching in a writing center setting. (pp. 77-86). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Connor, U. & Kramer, M. G. (1995). Writing from sources: Case studies of graduate students in business management. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.). Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy. (pp. 155-182). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Cornell University. http://www.cuinfo.cornell.edu/UAO/international.html. (May 6, 2000).

Dyson, A. H. (1995). Children out of bounds: The power case studies in expanding visions of literacy development. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K Kinzer (Eds.). Perspectives on literacy research and practice. (pp. 39-55). Chicago, IL: The National Reading Conference.

Educational Testing Service. http://www.toefl.org (December 6, 1999).

Engber, C. A. (1995). The relationship of lexical proficiency to the quality of ESL composition. Journal of second language writing. (Vol. 4, Number 2, pp. 139-155).

Holt, S. L. (1997, Summer). In L. Sigsbee, B. W. Speck, & B. Maylath (Eds.). Approaches to teaching non-native English speakers across the curriculum. (Number 70, pp. 69-76).

Johnson, E. (1997, Summer). Cultural norms affect oral communication in the classroom. In D. L. Sigsbee, B. W. Speck, & B. Maylath (Eds.). Approaches to teaching non-native English speakers across the curriculum. (Number 70, pp. 47-52).

Leki, I. (1995a). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. TESOL Quarterly. (vol. 29, pp. 235-260).

Leki, I. (1995b). Good writing: I know it when I see it. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.). Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy. (pp. 23-46). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

LoCastro, V. & Masuko, M. (1997). Plagiarism and academic writing of NNS learners. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 724).

Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. College English. (Vol. 47, number 8, pp. 789-808).

Mertens, D. M. (1998). Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moje, E. B. (1996). "I teach students, not subjects": Teacher-student relationships as context for secondary literacy. Reading research quarterly. (Vol. 31, number 2, pp. 172-195).

Noll, E. (1998). Experiencing literacy in and out of school. Journal of literacy research. (Vol. 30, number 2, pp. 205-232).

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. TESOL Quarterly. (Vol. 30, Number 2, pp. 201-230).

Powers, J. K. (1993, Spring). Rethinking writing center conferencing strategies for the ESL writer. The writing center journal. (Vol. 13, number 2, pp. 39-47).

Reyes, M. L. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. Harvard educational review. (Vol. 62, number 4, pp. 427-446).

Schneider, M. & Fujishima, N. K. (1995). When practice does not make perfect: The case study of a graduate ESL student. Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy. (pp. 2-22). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Scollon, R. (1994). As a matter of fact: The changing ideology of authorship and

responsibility in discourse. World Englishes. (Vol. 13, Number 1, pp. 33-46).

Sturlevant, E. G. (1996). Lifetime influences on the literacy-related instructional beliefs of experienced high school history teachers. Journal of literacy research. (Vol. 28, number 2, pp. 227-257).

University of California at Los Angeles. http://gdnet.ucla.edu/gasaa/admissions/TOEFL.HTM. (May 6, 2000).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. http://www.oar.uiuc.edu/prospective/intrnat/applyir.html. (May 6, 2000).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. http://www.wysiwyg://97http://www.iei.uiuc.edu/deil/matesl.html. (May 6, 2000).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Http://www.uiuc.edu/unit/oisa/resources/enrollment/. (May 6, 2000).